

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERPATENT
455610-2420

JUN 11 2007

REMARKS

In light of the above amendatory matter and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

At paragraph 3 of the outstanding final office action dated March 21, 2007, the Examiner objected to claims 23-27 and 32 because of a number of informalities. Applicants have amended these claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, and therefore request that the objection to these claims be withdrawn.

At paragraph 5 of the outstanding office action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-6, 11, 23-27, 32 and 43-49 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Baston (US Patent No. 4,809,189). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 43, 45 and 47 to recite what was seen as inherent in the claims as previously presented, that a downstream processing element requests processing from an upstream processing element, and that the upstream processing element performs processing only upon such a request. Furthermore, this processing is now recited as processing waveform data in accordance with input parameters. Indeed, Applicants submit that merely reading information out of a memory as suggested by the Examiner in Baston, is not in fact "processing" anything, and clearly does not rise to the level of processing of waveform data in accordance with input parameters as now recited.

Furthermore, in Baston, information is read from memory, or a buffer, the very problem that is addressed and avoided by the present invention defined by, for example, claim 44. In accordance with the invention, when processing elements that are processing waveform data are tied together, there is no need for massive intermediate buffers as the upstream processing only takes place after being requested by the downstream processing elements. There is no need to

PATENT
455610-2420

temporarily store, or buffer, the processed waveform data while waiting for a downstream request. Baston merely recites retrieving information from a memory location, and indeed would not process information in the manner contemplated or claimed in accordance with the present invention. Consequently, intermediate buffers are not required, and indeed, a pull-type processing system is generated by the present invention. Support for this inventive processing system is found in the application as originally filed at page 18, lines 4-22, with further examples of such processing at page 15, lines 5-17 and page 14, line 14 – page 15, line 2, as well as other portions of the specification as filed.

Independent claim 43 now recites “each of said plurality of processing elements adapted to receive waveform data and to process the received waveform data in accordance with said corresponding input parameters” This recitation makes it clear that processing requires more than reading data from memory, and indeed requires processing of data in accordance with input parameters. Furthermore, in accordance with the invention of claim 43, it is upstream processing, performed in response to a downstream request that provides the processed waveform data. Independent claims 45 and 47 recite similar elements.

As already noted, in contrast, the portions of Baston relied upon by the Examiner show no such processing. Rather a request to retrieve data from a buffer is shown. Indeed, as noted by Applicants in their application as filed, and as additionally presented in at least, for example dependent claims 46 and 49, the present inventions allows for the omission of intermediate buffers as processing by upstream processing elements only takes place upon a request from a downstream processing element -- when the downstream processing element needs input information. Applicants would suggest that merely retrieving data from a storage location does not constitute processing as claimed in the present invention as storage retrieval does not

PATENT
455610-2420

constitute "process[ing] the received waveform data in accordance with said corresponding input parameters."

Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claims 45 and 47 to present elements that were considered to be inherent in these claims as previously presented, namely that a plurality of connections are "indicated graphically" between the plurality of processing elements to define a flow of information therebetween. Thus, the elements in the graphical processing web are connected and allow information to flow therebetween in accordance with a graphical setup of connections between the processing elements of the apparatus. The setting of connections may be performed through the manipulation of a graphical representation of the processing taking place within the apparatus. Baston discloses no such graphical processing web.

Therefore, because Baston fails to teach each of the elements of independent claims 43, 45 and 47, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-6, 11, 23-27, 32 and 44, 46 and 48-49 depend from respective ones of independent claims 43, 45 and 47 and are therefore allowable for this reason alone, and additionally as presenting independently patentable combinations in their own right. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-6, 11, 23-27, 32 and 43-49 under 35 USC 102(b) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 7 of the outstanding office action the Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baston in view of Shirai (US Patent No. 5,736,971). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 43 and is therefore allowable for this reason alone. Furthermore, the present invention as recited in amended claim 13 is directed to a graphical representation of a processing web. Shirai describes a hardware system. Applicants

PATENT
455610-2420

submit that the hardware system of Shirai does not teach the use of the claimed pins in a graphical representation of the claimed processing web. Because Shirai fails to teach the claimed invention, and indeed fails to cure the defects noted above with respect to Baston, for this additional reason, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 8 of the outstanding office action the Examiner has particularly responded to Applicants' previously presented arguments. In light of amendments to the claims noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as currently presented request upstream processing, not merely data. Applicants therefore request reconsideration of the comments of paragraph 8 by the Examiner.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERPATENT
455610-2420

JUN 11 2007

CONCLUSION

Statements appearing above in respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney and, in the event the Examiner disagrees with any of such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place claims 2-6, 11, 13, 23-27, 32 and 43-49 in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any further outstanding issues.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800